



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/720,920	11/24/2003	Craig L. Reding	03-1024	5236
32127	7590	02/22/2008		
VERIZON PATENT MANAGEMENT GROUP 1515 N. COURTHOUSE ROAD, SUITE 500 ARLINGTON, VA 22201-2909			EXAMINER PATEL, HEMANT SHANTILAL	
			ART UNIT 2614	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 02/22/2008	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patents@VERIZON.COM

**Advisory Action  
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

10/720,920

Applicant(s)

REDING ET AL.

Examiner

Hemant Patel

Art Unit

2614

**--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

THE REPLY FILED 29 January 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:
- a) ☐ The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**NOTICE OF APPEAL**

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

**AMENDMENTS**

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
- (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
- (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
- The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
- Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.
- Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.
- Claim(s) rejected: 1-4 and 6-12.
- Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

**AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE**

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER**

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☒ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). 1/29/2008
13. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Regarding claim 1, the Applicant has argued (Remarks, pgs. 3-6) about the limitation "receiving, at the server, a selection, made by the user, of another one of the communication devices for which notifications are to be transmitted to the preferred communication device" indicating (Remarks, pg. 7) "If a user were to route messages from the host system based on the destination address of a message, as suggested by the Examiner, then all messages sent to the user's PC (which would all include the destination address of the user's PC) would be forwarded to the user's mobile data communication device, which is the opposite of pushing user-selected data items, as disclosed by LAZARIDIS et al. (column 2, lines 28-31)". This assertion of the Applicant indicates the admission that all messages sent to the selected device are forwarded (redirected) to another preferred communication device (this is analogous to call or message forwarding feature). Regarding the part of assertion by the Applicant that this "is opposite of pushing user-selected data items, as disclosed by LAZARIDIS", the Examiner respectfully disagrees. The Applicant has mistaken the flexibility provided by LAZARIDIS as not teaching the inherent characteristic of forwarding (redirecting) all notifications. LAZARIDIS clearly teaches that the user of the device has complete flexibility in configuring what data is redirected for which device to which device (col. 3, ll. 42-col. 4, ll. 4; col. 4, ll. 46-col. 5, ll. 7) and this flexibility includes changing this configuration on a global basis (i.e. for all messages) or per message basis for a device (col. 3, ll. 52-54). The Applicant has further argued (Remarks, pg. 7) that LAZARIDIS "does not mention another communication device for which notifications are to be transmitted to a preferred communication device". The Examiner respectfully disagrees. LAZARIDIS (col. 12, ll. 1-45) clearly teaches that the user defines different triggers (selection made by the user) and each trigger includes device address (another communication device) for which redirection is to take place, trigger event causing redirection and data (messages) to be redirected, and storing the information about the communication device (preferred communication device) to which data is redirected. Thus, LAZARIDIS clearly teaches the limitation "receiving, at the server, a selection, made by the user (user defining selections through triggers at the server), of another one of the communication devices for which notifications are to be transmitted (triggers include the device information for which messages are redirected) to the preferred communication device (storing the communication device information to which data is redirected)".

FAN TSANG  
SUPERVISOR/PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800